

✓ SOCIAL SCIENCES ✓

NATIONAL REVIEW

20 Cents

May 25, 1957

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

MAY 21 1957

DETROIT

Here's How to Cut the Budget

STYLES BRIDGES

The Hiss Maneuver

A SYMPOSIUM

The Law and the Spirit

GRACE LUMPKIN

Articles and Reviews by JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

L. BRENT BOZELL • F. R. BUCKLEY • WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR. • ROGER BECKET • W. H. PETERSON

For the Record

Walter Dorosh, Secretary of the Tool and Dye Section of the UAW, Local 600 (Ford) took the Fifth Amendment eight times last Tuesday when queried by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee about Communist affiliations. Paul Boatin, another Local 600 leader, testified that he had been a member of the Communist Party until his expulsion from it in 1949....A Grand Jury in Los Angeles has called upon the LA County Supervisors to explain their reasons for supporting the UAW boycott of Kohler products.

In the fifteen months since the de-Stalinization drive, Daily Worker subscriptions have dropped by almost one-half. The Worker has 6,200 readers today as opposed to 11,500 in March, 1956....In San Francisco, the California Labor School is closing after failing to reverse a Subversive Activities Control Board ruling that it was "Communist controlled"....The United States Court of Appeals last week unanimously upheld the conviction of atom spy Morton Sobell.

The Nebraska and New Hampshire legislatures have passed resolutions calling for a halt to the present grants-in-aid arrangements on the grounds that they often force individual states into programs they cannot afford....Heftier school needs, bigger welfare programs, wage hikes and highway construction costs are expected to result in raised taxes in at least half of the states this year....Treasury sources report the corporate tax take is falling below expectations, another threat to the balanced budget.

President Eisenhower says he is still opposed to a federal dam project in Hell's Canyon. A bill to cancel the franchise of a private power company which is at present developing the Snake River in Hell's Canyon is expected to reach the Senate this week....Education Secretary Folsom admitted last week that the states have the funds to finance their own school construction programs; but, he said, federal financing still was necessary because the states might not give education the highest priority.

The American Academy of Public Affairs (Box 862, Ramona, San Diego County, Calif.) announces that it will make awards this year to books and publications that aid "in the restoration of our constitutional form of government."

NATIONAL REVIEW

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF OPINION

EDITOR and PUBLISHER: Wm. F. Buckley, Jr.

EDITORS

L. Brent Bozell James Burnham
John Chamberlain Willmoore Kendall
Suzanne La Follette William S. Schlammm

PRODUCTION EDITOR: Mabel Wood

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENT: Sam M. Jones

ASSOCIATES

Priscilla L. Buckley Frank S. Meyer
Jonathan Mitchell Morrie Ryskind

CONTRIBUTORS

C. D. Batchelor, John C. Caldwell, Frank Chodorov, John Abbot Clark, Forrest Davis, A. Derso, Max Eastman, Medford Evans, Karl Hess, John D. Kreuttner, J. B. Matthews, Gerhart Niemeyer, Revilo Oliver, E. Merrill Root, Freda Utley, Richard M. Weaver, Gen. Charles A. Willoughby

FOREIGN CONTRIBUTORS

London: Anthony Lejeune
Geneva: Willhelm Roepke Madrid: J. Dervin
Munich: E. v. Kuehnelt-Leddihn

BUSINESS MANAGER: Theodore A. Driscoll

ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLISHER: J. P. McFadden

CONTENTS

MAY 25, 1957 VOL. III, NO. 21

THE WEEK 487

ARTICLES

Here's How to Cut the Budget ... Styles Bridges 493
The Hiss Maneuver A Symposium 496
The Law and the Spirit Grace Lumpkin 498

DEPARTMENTS

For the Record 486
National Trends L. Brent Bozell 492
The Ivory Tower Wm. F. Buckley, Jr. 500
Arts and Manners William S. Schlammm 501
To the Editor 506

BOOKS IN REVIEW

One-Up on Everybody John Chamberlain 502
Inside Orpheus Roger Becket 503
Brilliant Economist William H. Peterson 504
A Critics' Critic F. R. Buckley 504
Much to Learn Revilo Oliver 505

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly, except second and third weeks in August, at Orange, Conn., by National Weekly, Inc. Copyrighted 1957 in the U.S.A. by National Weekly, Inc. Second-class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.

EDITORIAL AND SUBSCRIPTION OFFICES:

211 East 37th St.
New York 16, N. Y.
Telephone: MUrray Hill 2-0941

RATES, Twenty cents a copy, \$7.00 a year, \$13.00 for two years. Foreign, \$9.00 a year; Canada, \$8.00 a year.

The editors cannot be responsible for unsolicited manuscripts unless return postage, or better, a stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed. Opinions expressed in signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the editors.

The WEEK

● Under a picture of Alger Hiss the *New York Times* spreads the caption: "A man looking for a job." Are we, then, to look forward to one of those ubiquitous subway ads featuring still another happy and smiling individual who proclaims to the world, "I found my job through the *New York Times*"?

● President Ngo Dinh Diem apparently failed to win a hike in U.S. aid to Vietnam during his recent visit to Washington. And how did he react? He immediately turned around and invited private capital to invest in South Vietnam, offering as inducement guarantees against nationalization or confiscation, free import of capital goods, repatriation of profits and a liberal policy of tax rebates during the first few years of operation. What's more, he has yet to make a single anti-American statement!

● *Struggle To The Death Department*: The Bronxville (N.Y.) Forum Committee is sponsoring a debate on "The Future of the United Nations" between the president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the president of the United World Federalists.

● Under the chairmanship of Senator Estes Kefauver, the Senate's Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee is about to launch a rip-roaring, muck-raking investigation of American business practices, a project that, the chairman is undoubtedly hoping, will carry him to the 1960 Democratic Presidential nomination. For chief economist in this inquiry, Senator Kefauver has hired one John M. Blair. Mr. Blair is author of a book named *Seeds of Destruction*, greeted upon publication in 1938 by the enthusiastic applause of the English Marxist, Harold Laski. The book's thesis, argued by standard Marxian dialectical proofs, is simple, namely: that capitalism and private enterprise are no good, that they throw the masses out of work, lower their real living standards, and pile up luxuries in the hands of "the upper classes." It is not on record that Mr. Blair has repudiated or changed his views. It takes the old-timers back to the good old New Deal days when the staffs of similar congressional committees were being run by Alger Hiss, Lee Pressman, John Abt, Henry Collins and friends.

● The new "soft" line of the Kremlin seems to be making headway in Japan. The number of avowed Japanese Communists may be ridiculously small, the Party's daily newspaper may be declining in circula-

tion, and the recent de-Stalinization may have played hob with the local movement's hard core. Nevertheless, the ability of the Communists to manipulate Japanese public opinion is demonstrably on the increase. Observers date the beginning of this from the reopening of the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo. Does anyone rise to remark at this point that "recognition" of an enemy nation is a mere *de facto* thing, having no moral or even practical significance?

● The *New York Times* was, of course, available to Nikita Khrushchev when he needed a diplomatic forum in which to make a bid for another summit parley and a deal. But at least Mr. Turner Catledge, the managing editor of the *Times*, kept his tongue and his wits about him when he entered the great man's presence. He even dared throw up the question of Hungary. The answer he got was quite illuminating—the Soviet boss thinks "the Hungarians have their own independent state, their own independent government and are pursuing their own independent policy," whereas England and America keep their "colonial countries" "in bounds by various means." If that is what Khrushchev actually thinks, there is no use talking with him further. On the other hand, if that is not what he actually thinks, there is no use talking with him either. The man who can equate Soviet tanks with "independence" is quite beyond the reach of words, whether at the summit or in the depths.

● The Democrats are having a ball with Sherman Adams' statement that the budget can be cut two billion dollars without prejudice to the quality—quality, mind you—of U.S. government services. So many conflicting voices in the Administration, says phrase-coiner Lyndon Johnson, make for confusion "completely confounded"; and place the Administration in a "completely bewildering" position. He does not, however, press the points that want pressing, namely: Who are the agency heads who sent in inflated estimates of their financial requirements? What explanation does Mr. Adams have to offer for their conduct—that of incompetence, or that of liking to spend public funds for just plain spending's sake? Why did the Bureau of the Budget not deflate the inflated estimates before submitting them? Why did not Mr. Adams himself deflate them? Does he then agree that some heads, including perhaps his own, ought to roll? And, most urgently of all, if he now concedes that two billion can go without impairment of quality, is he all that certain three or five billion cannot?

● For the first time since India became independent, Nehru's Congress Party has lost the local elections in the critical Bombay district. With disputes over

"linguistic autonomy" complicating the usual economic and political issues, an opposition front ranging from Communists to Hindu extremists ran up a substantial majority. The Communist vote, as has been the case in nearly all Indian elections that have been held this year, was at a new high.

● Peter Fryer, the prominent Communist reporter for the London *Daily Worker* who was in Budapest last October and November, and who subsequently made a publicized break with the British Communist Party, has become London correspondent of the orthodox "Cannonite" wing of the American Trotskyites. "I remain a Communist," Fryer declared. "I will go on fighting for the transformation of the Communist Party into a genuine Communist party." Fryer's bitterly anti-American, anti-Western—and fraudulent—book on the Hungarian events (*Hungarian Tragedy*) has been touted as the authentic history by Liberals and Socialists the world over. It is rumored that tens of thousands of copies have been distributed in Asia, Africa, and parts of Europe by the use of U.S. secret funds.

● Millions of years ago, the earth shook, a mountain came down and a retreating ocean left in its wake a handful of deep, cool, lochs in the Scottish Highlands. Did it also leave behind a prehistoric monster, the fabled monster of Loch Ness? The argument has raged hot and heavy since the thing was first sighted in 1871, with the skeptics generally winning out. But now a new book, Constance Wyeth's *More than a Legend*, makes such a good case for the monster, or monsters, that the British Parliament is considering an investigation of Loch Ness. We hope it never comes off. As pro-monsterites we like to think there's something up, down there.

● In three out of four by-elections held recently in Syria, anti-Western left-wing candidates of the Baath Party, backed by Nasser and the Communists, triumphed over their right-wing opponents. Although the margins were fairly close, this was nonetheless a victory for the pro-Soviet government of Premier el-Assali. The conservative candidates, who themselves represented an extreme Moslem nationalism rather than a pro-Western political orientation, have charged widespread ballot-box stuffing by the police and government agents.

● Janos Kadar, the Moscow puppet now calling himself premier of Hungary, and his 298 fellow-puppets who affect to be Hungary's parliament, have just completed a three day session. Carrying the Hitler-Stalin parliamentary methods a neat step further, Kadar simply announced, without wasting time over either discussion or vote, that a series of constitu-

tional amendments had been adopted by "an overwhelming majority." By a show of hands counted as unanimous by the surrounding security guards, the scheduled new election was postponed for two years. Since the people were solidly back of him, Kadar explained, an election would be a pointless extravagance. Parliament then adjourned without setting any date for its next meeting.

The Knopf Case

Alger Hiss' sally has been beaten back and his forces are licking their wounds in the fever-swamps of the left-wing press. The evidence repelled Hiss, and did so handily. He is easy; the facts had substance to spare when they were through with him. Notwithstanding, there is an ugly stench in the air—the kind of air in which Hiss and his Communists prosper. It will be a while before the air is freshened.

For the publication of Hiss' book has served as the occasion for one or two of the crabbed and festering enemies of Whittaker Chambers to reiterate their noisome slanders. Here once again, under the pretext of reviewing a book—better, under the pretext of pursuing justice—was the opportunity to lash out, sparing neither decency nor taste, at the man who bore witness against a conspiracy the elite had refused to root out, and went on to write the most illuminating and moving book of our time on the nature of the conspiracy. They have not passed up the opportunity: there is relish in their assault. They are savoring every blasphemy; for it may be a long, long time before another Alfred Knopf gives them such opportunity.

Mr. Alfred Knopf is, indeed, the principal enigma, for he is the impresario of this episode. Alfred Knopf is a sponsor of Hungarian Relief. As a citizen, Knopf joins with those who call for forthright action against the enemy in Hungary; in his professional life he is sponsoring the activities of the enemy in our midst.

What moves Mr. Knopf? A solicitude for the processes of justice? But the processes of justice have been meticulously observed, where Hiss is concerned. A desire to supply Hiss with a supplementary medium for reiterating the defense that a jury of his peers and echelon after echelon of judges dismissed as a tissue of lies? Why? It is the duty of a publisher to come forward when there is an active, collusive conspiracy to suppress the publication of an honest book. Was there such an effort to suppress Hiss' book? And is it honest? If Knopf understands himself merely to be doing a professional duty by a dissident point of view, why does he not in his personal capacity—in the capacity in which he cries out against the outrage of Hungary—proclaim the truth as he sees it? That Hiss is persevering in an attempt

to perpetuate a gigantic and evil fraud. Or—if this is what he really believes—that Hiss was framed by Chambers, Massing, Weyl, the Committee, the juries, the FBI, and the courts.

Or is it all, for Knopf, just a business venture? What will he do with the profits? Donate them to Hungarian Relief?



No Strings Attached

Monty Fit the Battle of Gettysburg

Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery and President Eisenhower performed a modern miracle the other day: they climbed all around the battlefield of Gettysburg with their feet in their mouths.

Never will the South—or the North, for that matter—forget what they said there. Lee was a bum. Meade, the Union general who merely won the battle, should have been sacked. Pickett's charge at the strong center of the Union line was "absolutely monstrous." The Confederate cavalry just wasn't there in the clutch. Etcetera, etcetera.

We wouldn't for the world dispute the twenty-two hindsight of two old soldiers when it comes to abstract consideration of tactics. But we seem to remember the words of a "naval personage," Sir Winston Churchill, about the "fog of war," meaning the uncertainties, human and otherwise, that lurk in any far-ranging contest. The fog of war was thick over the field of Gettysburg for three fateful days.

Longstreet, upon whom Lee depended, was in a sulk. Jeb Stuart, Lee's cavalryman, was off somewhere, just ridin' 'round. When Pickett crashed the Union center, he expected other forces to follow up with the haymaker punch which Lee had ordered but couldn't get Longstreet to deliver. As for Meade, he had just taken charge of the Union troops two days before the battle, which is like being introduced to the ball club as manager just in time to hand the day's lineup to the umpire.

In the circumstances both Lee and Meade were perhaps lucky to do as well as they did. Fortunately a politician named Abe Lincoln knew that you don't get good work out of future generals if you make it a habit to fire a winner. As for a politician named Jeff Davis, he probably knew that if he sacked Lee the Confederate cause would crumble within a month.

Come to think of it, Monty, though victorious like Meade, never did manage to exploit his successes by getting his mitts on Rommel. Nor did Ike get any better cooperation before the Bulge from his G2 than Lee got from Jeb Stuart. By their own standards maybe both Ike and Monty should have been sacked too.

On the whole, if Mr. Eisenhower wants to deflate some military legends, he might look into Field Marshal Alanbrooke's recent book on the performance of certain World War II generals. At the very least he would learn from Alanbrooke that it's dangerous to mistake a boomerang for a stone.

A Riddle for the Sphinx

It is not yet clear just who won what from the Jordanian crisis, but it is certain that Egypt's Colonel Nasser is a big loser. And the loss must be particularly galling, coming as it does just as he was about to celebrate, with the reopening of the Suez Canal on his terms, the first great political victory ever won by an abject military defeat.

Nasser aspires to suzerainty over what he wishes to believe is an "Arab world." Toward that end he had linked Egypt with Syria and Saudi Arabia. Through his own and Moscow's agents he was moving confidently toward the incorporation of Jordan within his budding empire. Suddenly the boy-King Hussein stood back on his heels, took up the Egyptian challenge, and cast Nasser's operatives into graves or prison or exile.

In a region where "face" counts as heavily as guns, and for a military dictator still reeling from the Israeli Army's blow, that was bad enough. But Nasser's troubles were further compounded. Not only did young Hussein defy him. His Saudi Arabian ally supported his new enemy, sending money and offering troops. King Feisal of Iraq stood firmly be-

hind his Jordanian cousin. Syria, though mouthing the pro-Nasser phrases, backed away. And even Moscow, the backstage heavy, had no taunt for the Sixth Fleet.

For Nasser, in short, the Jordanian affair has been up to this point an unmitigated disaster. It is the law of such careers as his, in volatile nations like Egypt, that they cannot endure many setbacks. The curve must keep mounting; if it turns downward for even a short while, it drops quickly to the bottom. Nasser is shrewd enough to know this—if he did not, the shifting moods of the masses upon whose shoulders he stands would quickly teach him. He therefore, it would seem, must soon try to recoup, to reverse the downward trend by some move both unexpected and successful.

Just what it will be cannot be seen in advance. The choice is wide, and Nasser himself has perhaps not yet made up his mind. He may take the plunge into a desperate adventure. But we cannot exclude, even, the move that would be the most unexpected of all, and possibly the most successful—a jump clear over the fence, into the camp of the West.

No Case

In a political warfare campaign that shows energy and talents one would never suspect from the record of USIA against the Communists, the State Department has been trying to bludgeon the Senate into confirming the treaty setting up an International Atomic Energy Agency. Secretary of State Dulles has appeared as the prime witness before the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senators and the public press have been flooded with departmental propaganda handouts, including an elaborate "reply to questions" raised by Senator Bourke Hickenlooper and a forty-three page "explanation" of what the treaty means to the United States.

The net impression, which tends to become stronger as its spokesmen go on protesting a bit too much, is: they have failed to make out a case. Their whole argument, indeed, is curiously defensive and negative, as if the officials who drew up the briefs did not themselves really think that their ground was solid.

The Department does not, and cannot, deny the criticisms that have been made of the treaty. Anyone who reads it over can see that under its terms a) United States fissionable material can go to Communist nations, b) Red China is eligible for membership in the proposed Agency, c) the United States can be outvoted, d) the Agency-channeled U-235 can be adapted for military use, and e) American nuclear secrets can get into enemy hands. So the treaty's advocates can only plead that these dangers haven't

yet come about, and would not necessarily come about; and anyway our delegates will be watching out for them day and night. But why in the world deliberately expose ourselves to dangers that would not exist if there were no International Atomic Energy Agency? Why create the dangers by creating the Agency? On this, the Department is silent.

It is true, of course, that the United States does have much to gain from expanded international interrelations (both government and civilian) in the field of atomic energy. This truth—the reiteration of which is the major part of the Department's arguments—is irrelevant to the question whether the IAEA is the most suitable means for advancing such relations in a manner consonant with the interests of the United States. Secretary Dulles has utterly failed to prove why our legitimate interests are not much better served—without the undeniable dangers—by a series of flexible bilateral treaties and agreements and such multilateral arrangements as NATO, some of which are already functioning. State Department spokesmen, hard pressed on this point, fell back on the transparently feeble statement that our national "prestige" was involved in the Agency's creation. What they must have meant was *their* prestige—the prestige of the globalist wing of the Department's bureaucracy, which is publicly committed to the treaty.

It is hard to escape the summary conclusion that the ultimate purpose of the globalists in pressing for the IAEA is, once again, to use the treaty power to set up one more agency that will be beyond the control of Congress and the checks of our constitutional procedures.

Knives and Fools

The burgeoning united front between the official and the Trotskyite Communists (reported by Mr. James Burnham in our April 6 issue) has now ripened its first poisonous fruit. "American Forum—For Socialist Education" has hung out its shingle. It calls on all dupes to join in "study and serious untrammelled political discussion among all elements that think of themselves as related to historic Socialist and labor traditions, values and objectives . . . however bitter their differences may have been."

The official Communist side is represented by the old wheel-horses of its united front and fellow-traveling organizations, such as Doxie Wilkerson, Russell Nixon, Albert Blumberg and W. E. B. Dubois; they are flanked by the academic riffraff that for years has been giving the Party a university cover: Professors Dirk Bodde (Pennsylvania), H. H. Wilson (Princeton), Mulford Sibley (Minnesota), Paul Baran (Stanford), William A. Williams (Oregon),

Kermit Eby (Chicago), and Stringfellow Barr (former President of St. John's College).

The Trotskyites have put several of their public leaders on the Board (Farrell Dobbs, their standard Presidential candidate, and Bert Cochran). The formation of the Forum is the first occasion since the 1929 split when Trotskyites and official Communists have joined to push the same organization.

These two wings are the striking force, but they are screened by a motley brigade of irregulars who, out of either slyness or incorrigible political stupidity, are lending their names to this cynical new move in the Communists' post-Hungary drive for re-legitimization. The unusually soft-headed pacifist, Rev. A. J. Muste, who has learned nothing from his previous excursions with both Stalinists and Trotskyites, is Chairman of the Board that has coralled also the Catholic pacifist, Dorothy Day, and the Jewish pacifist, Milton Mayer. The neo-Titoist, Joseph Starobin, former foreign editor of the *Daily Worker*, sits alongside Clifford McAvoy, the Communist-controlled American Labor Party's favorite candidate for Mayor of New York. John T. McManus, editor of the Communist-oriented *National Guardian*, has clubbed up with editor Bayard Rustin of the Socialist-directed *Liberation*.

All this was simple and rather predictable, but there is one thing that makes us ponder the fallacies of the political mind: Why do those professional operators assume that the time has come to make the C.P. more respectable than at any time since 1945?

Never More Never-Never Land

It has been a hot day and the children under the maple tree are lying at their ease, lazily munching the sweet spring grass.

"Of course it's not true," says one. "That's for sure. But if it were . . . just for fun, if some one came up right now and said, 'I'll give you one wish,' would you . . .?"

Would you, what? Why go to Oz, of course. Be wafted in the flicker of a hummingbird's wing over the Impassable Desert to the wonderful blue-yellow-red-purple Land of Oz and follow the yellow brick road to the City of Emerald presided over by Ozma the Fair, a gracious and (to the excitement of generations of children) perpetually-threatened Princess. To meet her friends and courtiers: The Lion who is Cowardly by name but brave by necessity. The Tin Woodman, of tender heart. The wise Scarecrow and the irascible but loyal Sawhorse. To stand beside them against the Wicked Witches of the East and West and bravely foil the dastardly plots of the loathsome King of the Gnomes.

Whether the children under the maple tree are

dressed in the middy blouses, pleated skirts and knickers of the turn of the century or in today's shorts and blue jeans, the wonderful day dream of Oz remains the same—a Baked Alaska of the imagination to be savored and tasted to its foamy depth.

But this really is not a good thing, it now turns out. That we have from an authority—the Director of the Detroit Public Libraries, Mr. Ralph Ulveling, who announced last week that he had swept his shelves clean of any trace of Oziana. Mr. Ulveling (we're sure *he* never fought the King of the Gnomes—or Long John Silver—or Captain Kidd) finds the Oz books "negative." They give youth the "wrong approach to life." They "drag young minds down to a cowardly level," and "mislead" children. Fantasy is a devalued commodity among progressive educators and librarians these days, for it confuses the little minds which might profitably devote their time to useful books (e.g., *How the Little Red Fire Engine Works*), or socially uplifting books (e.g., *Singh Lee, Adopted Son of Battery C*).

We warn you, Ulveling. Come anywhere near *our* public library and we'll utter that magic and terrible word, known only to the elite of Oz—and Presto! you'll be turned into an Ass.

But what's the use? . . . The citizens of Detroit, having a deficient imagination, will probably look at Mr. Ulveling and fail to see the change.

'How They Fool People . . .'

"I have never read the court record in the Hiss case. I had concluded, from the press, that Hiss was guilty. I am now [having read Hiss' book] more inclined to believe that Hiss was not guilty on either count."

MORRIS ERNST in an advertisement by Alfred Knopf for Hiss' book, *N.Y. Times*, May 13, 1957

"I know of no one who has told before so clearly the reasons why people do things like this, how they fool people, use them innocently, actually drag them in into the gutters of stealth. . . . The same courage, directness and ability for action that made Hede Massing dare to go to Russia in 1937, when she feared for her safety during the purge, has motivated the writing of this book, and her deep loyalty now as an American. . . . I wish that all our legislators, officials and public leaders would read this volume. . . . Mrs. Massing manages to convey vividly the motivations and sentiments that animated successful people to join the underground of dictatorship."

MORRIS ERNST, in an Introduction to Hede Massing's *This Deception* (Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1951), which recounts Mrs. Massing's meeting with Alger Hiss in the Communist underworld in 1935.

NATIONAL TRENDS

L. BRENT BOZELL

...To See Where Sits the Wind

There is a conservative revolt within the Republican Party, and the questions are: What kind of a revolt is it—over ideology? over tactics? What are its present dimensions? Where is it likely to lead? And—the hardest one of all to answer—How did it ever get off the ground on the apparently small rations dispensed by the American electorate for the purpose last November?

A couple of weeks ago this correspondent sat in on a meeting of a local Republican organization (in Maryland it was) which, besides confirming the existence of the revolt, provided some illuminating clues to its present character and extent. To begin with, this group of Republicans was predominantly “modern” in the sense that most of the individuals in it had no commitments to Senator Taft and pristine Republican principles, and were supporters of Eisenhowerism because it provided, they believed, a winning political formula. In other words, a group fairly representative of grass-roots Republicanism on the Eastern seaboard. (I mention the group’s prepossessions, not in order to generalize about the audience-reaction to what followed—which was, incidentally, sympathetic; but because the speakers undoubtedly had been briefed on the kind of group it was, and such speakers as these were do not normally prepare their remarks with the idea of eliciting tomatoes and rotten eggs.)

Embarrassing Tale

The speakers were Senator Andrew Schoepel (Kans.) and Congressman Richard Simpson (Pa.), the chiefs, respectively, of the Senate and House GOP campaign committees; and their subject: How Can We Elect a Republican Congress in 1958? Rep. Simpson, however, led off with an argument more properly under the heading, *Do We Want to Elect a Republican Congress in 1958*, and illustrated it

with a tale that must have embarrassed as much in the telling as in the listening.

Taking tacit account of Mr. Eisenhower’s misgivings on the subject, Simpson took the bull by the horns. As it happened, Simpson said, he and Senator Schoepel had had breakfast that very morning with Meade Alcorn, GOP National Chairman, and the question had come up of whether the President wanted a Congress led by his own party. Alcorn had replied that he was seeing Mr. Eisenhower later in the morning, and that he would put the matter to him, “directly.” That afternoon Alcorn had reported the verdict: “I asked the President whether he wanted a GOP Congress, and he said emphatically [Simpson indicating by smashing fist on table] ‘I do.’ And what is more, he put it in writing.” (!)

The New Argument

The point about the tale (yes, it was told dead-pan) is not the obvious one, but that the reassurances Simpson sought to convey marked the extent of Mr. Eisenhower’s role in the evening’s festivities. The speakers, in their official capacities of party campaign leaders, found it neither desirable, nor themselves obliged, to as much as mention the arguments of 1954 and 1956: that a GOP Congress must be elected in order to “enact the President’s program,” and to “give support to the President’s principles.” The argument worth making, as they saw it, is that Eisenhower is not *against* a Republican Congress. And therein a considered judgment, by experts, that the President’s hold on the electorate has shifted in character from positive to negative. That it is good to have him on your side, but not necessarily as your captain, either actual or symbolic.

With that as their point of departure, Messrs. Simpson and Schoepel proceeded to outline a strategy for

the 1958 elections that leaves the President and his entourage out in the cold. Citing the White House’s failure to support GOP congressional candidates effectively or even enthusiastically, in 1954 and 1956, Simpson announced: “We will not accept White House leadership in 1958.”

Senator Schoepel was more specific. He paid his respects to past White House efforts to hand-pick candidates, and then declared: “There will be no dictation from Washington [in 1958] as to candidates.” And more important—“there will be no dictation” on “local issues.” By which Schoepel did not mean the proposed bridge over the Platte River, but national issues on which local communities might have views very different from those of the GOP National Committee.

Anti-Administration Revolt

Schoepel’s reason for rejecting White House leadership was, on the surface, entirely pragmatic: “Ike’s and Dick’s coattails are not broad enough.” For Republicans, that is. “We brought out hundreds of thousands of people [in 1956],” he said, “who voted for Ike, and [who] then turned around and voted for [Democratic congressional candidates].”

This revised estimate of the President’s influence on the electorate is the key to the kind of anti-Administration revolt that is now occurring in Congress. Except in isolated instances (e.g., Senator Goldwater), it does not yet amount to a repudiation of Eisenhowerism. It is more in the nature of a declaration of independence. A notification by congressional Republicans to executive Republicans that the former will, for the time being, plot their own course.

The course the rebels will plot—as opposed to the one they would like to plot if they had their ideological wishes—depends on the weather; and it is understood that the weather may not be the same everywhere in the country. This was the key point in Simpson’s and Schoepel’s presentation—local autonomy on candidates and issues. Senator Schoepel left no doubt as to the kind of platform he would run on: “We pledged ourselves to reduce spending,” and to “tie a tax cut” to a reduction in expenditures:

(Continued on p. 495)

Here's How to Cut the Budget

Unmoved by Mr. Eisenhower's sentimentalism on the air, Mr. Bridges—truly “a Senator's Senator”—shows where and how the monstrous federal budget can be cut

STYLES BRIDGES

On January 16, 1957, the people of this country awoke with a rude shock. Lulled to sleep by four years of budgets reduced from the Korean War high of President Truman, and further lulled by two years of balanced budgets, they were ill prepared for the largest peacetime budget in history. I shared with them their surprise. This third year in a row of balanced budgets was a noteworthy Eisenhower accomplishment but I thought it ought to be accompanied by some reduction in spending to go along with the outstanding progress along that line which the President had made in 1953, 1954 and 1955.

In my experience of twenty-one years on the Senate Appropriations Committee I have seen showers for economy before, but they have soon evaporated when the hot sun of the spending lobbies has been brought to bear. However, I felt that the largest peacetime budget in history—71 billion 800 million dollars—called for action and I knew that for action to be effective the public must be thoroughly aroused.

It seemed to me ironical that in a year of peak prosperity, of highest employment on record at top wages, and a year of highest government income from taxation, we should be absorbing practically all of that income in governmental expenditure. Even the slim \$1.8 billion surplus predicted depended substantially on the postal rate increase which still remains to be passed by the Congress. When, if ever, would we make a reduction in the current \$274 billion national debt which calls for \$7 billion a year in interest charges alone? Large as this interest figure is, it could grow to \$9 billion before much longer as prior borrowing is refunded at current interest rates.

Perhaps we have become so used

to talking in big figures that they have lost their ability to shock us. Just let me give a dramatic illustration of what that amount of debt and the interest on it means. The debt in dollar bills laid end to end would encompass the 24,000 mile circumference of the earth 1,080 times, and the interest would encompass it twenty-five times. The \$71.8 billion amount called for in the budget can be expressed this way. Let us assume that a person working the average work week were to spend one working hour in the consideration of the expenditure of each one million dollars in the requested budget—certainly not an over-long period for such a sum of money—it would take him to the year 2000 thus to consider the total budget.

A Realistic Plan

In realizing that an aroused public was necessary for effective, substantial budget cutting, I also realized that it must be given a specific plan for a rallying point. Therefore, after careful budget analysis, on February 17 I presented my specific plan for budget cutting. Fortunately also, from the standpoint of alerting the public, a warning came at the same time from within the Administration's official family. That was when Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, a world-respected figure in fiscal affairs, said that a continuation of inflationary trends, of which this federal budget was an integral part, could bring on a depression which “would curl your hair.”

Here, specifically, is my plan for budget cuts where I feel they could be best absorbed. Bear in mind in going through the outline of the plan that there may be differences of opinion in regard to the amount which can be cut, but I believe most will

agree in regard to the areas. In presenting this plan I realize that this amount of cuts is minimum. However, I wanted to present a plan that was realistic from the standpoint of accomplishment. The important thing is to halt and reverse the trend and then confirm it in successive sessions for drastic debt reduction and for much-needed tax relief.

First off there is an area of 17 billion 300 million dollars, of which 11 billion 637 million is interest on the national debt, veterans' compensation, various pensions, benefit programs and trust funds affecting widows and orphans and the aged. These are all considered sacred obligations. Then there are other items making up the above figure, such as Soil Bank, commodity credit corporation, agricultural conservation program, grants to states for public assistance, and other matters of that sort which could not be effectively cut without modifying legislation. In certain of those items I would not hesitate to introduce the modifying legislation because out of the 5 billion 863 million total of all items in this latter area, I feel that a possible saving of \$500 million could be achieved.

Aside from the sacred obligations and those items needing specific legislative action, there is left a balance of \$54.2 billion from the total budget figure of \$71.8 billion. In this area there is proposed 1 billion 716 million for public works, aside from the federal interstate highway network approved at the last session of Congress. With the inflationary pressures that are everywhere evident, it seems to me that the public works program should not be expanded at this time. I therefore propose that it be held to the 1956 figure, plus the much-needed airways modernization program, and not touching the overdue highway

program. This would mean a cut of approximately \$575 million.

In the same \$54.2 billion area, the largest single item is that for Defense—\$38 billion—an increase of \$2 billion over the fiscal year 1957. As the ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as the Appropriations Committee, I am acutely aware of the needs of the military and I would yield to no one in the matter of zeal and concern for this country's strongest possible defense posture. I feel, also, that I am particularly alert to the dangers of Communist aggression and the fact that the superb striking power of our armed forces is the greatest deterrent to that aggression today. Yet I am also aware that our striking power is dependent on our economic health and that the fevers of inflation could seriously undermine that health.

The military, in its proper concern for our defense posture, is perhaps too close to its own particular tree to get the over-all view of the forest. I think they have asked for more money than can be purposefully used in the fiscal year 1958. Thirty-eight billion is an awful lot of money and I am proposing in this item to make a cut of \$750 million, which would still leave the military 37 billion 250 thousand dollars—or 1 billion 250 million dollars more than in the current year. This cut would amount to slightly under 2 per cent of the request and it too must be viewed, together with the estimated \$10.6 billion in unobligated balance in the Defense Department at the end of the fiscal year 1958. As the hearings on the Defense budget progress, I will be looking hard to see if the \$750 million cut can be increased to one billion.

Foreign Aid Cuts

Foreign Aid is another big item. The request is for \$4.4 billion. Unlike other budget requests, there will be no breakdown of this amount available until late in the session. Therefore, it is hard to be specific at this time. However, with my staff, I have made a study of the yearly difference between the budget request at the beginning of the session and the actual amount finally granted by the Congress in each of the last four years. The average cut was 21.6 per

cent. I would, therefore, advocate applying that percentage cut to the present figure, which would produce a saving of \$950 million. When the actual figures are available there may be some variation in the amount to be cut, but at the present time I am applying the best available formula. In reviewing the amount requested for Foreign Aid it should be borne in mind that there is currently approximately 6 billion 30 million in unexpended balance.

Besides the cut in accordance with the formula I have set forth above, an additional cut of \$250 million, making a total cut in Foreign Aid of \$1.2 billion, is possible. I say this because I seriously question whether or not all of our Foreign Aid funds are spent within the declared and enacted policy of Congress, as expressed in the Mutual Security Act. I would call to the attention of our taxpaying citizens the fact that it is the declared policy of that Act to make available to free nations and peoples, upon request, assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom. I would also point out that the over-all purpose of the Mutual Security Act is to promote mutual security between the United States and its free-world friends. I shall want to review Foreign Aid—especially to countries like Yugoslavia, India and Indonesia, in the light of that policy.

Finally, I feel that at least a total of \$300 million could be lopped off in miscellaneous items in a list too long to itemize for the purposes of this article. With this final amount an aggregate cut of 3 billion 325 million would be made, which would come to an over-all percentage figure of 5.5 per cent in the area outside of the so-called sacred obligations. In the category of miscellaneous items would come the 5 per cent over-all cut which Secretary Humphrey has agreed to take in the Treasury Department in suiting his present actions to his former words. He has agreed not to appeal to the Senate a cut in that amount made by the House. There are various other small over-all cuts which could be made,

as well as refusing to provide the money to institute new programs.

The public reaction to all this has been tremendous and unabated. People realize that to put their own fiscal houses in order they must reduce their debts by retrenchment in spending so as to place themselves in the strongest possible position for the proverbial rainy day. They are demanding that their federal government do likewise because if the federal fiscal house should fall their own individual houses would come tumbling down also. Furthermore they are well aware that the Communist tactic for world domination is as much geared to producing domestic economic collapse in their victims as it is to direct frontal assault by force of arms.

Progress Report

Congress has now been in session four and one-half months. What is the midstream progress report on the battle of the budget? Thanks to unabated public pressure and the tireless efforts of the congressional leaders for economy, the report is good from the standpoint of those who favor budget cutting. Here is the up-to-the-moment rundown in brief.

Of the regular appropriations bills which have been sent over to the Senate from the House, the various departments and agencies have not appealed an approximate total of \$547 million of the 1 billion 210 million of House cuts, as follows:

Treasury-Post Office	\$ 14,159,000
Commerce & Related agencies	138,178,500
Independent Offices	260,658,700
Interior	7,554,625
State, Justice, Judiciary, USIA	34,786,447
General Government Matters	4,551,500
Labor-HEW	86,855,000
Total	\$546,743,772

That is money already cut from the budget.

Next, the President has cooperated in the economy drive by offering his own suggestions for cutting.

In a letter addressed to Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn on April 18, in response to House Resolution 190, the President pointed out possible cuts totaling 1 billion 858 million dollars. If these suggestions are added to

the House cuts not appealed, and any overlapping in the two figures is eliminated, a total of 2 billion 330 million dollars in savings will be accomplished.

That amount of 2 billion 330 million dollars is just one billion dollars short of the goal of my announced plan, and the big spending bills have not even reached the Senate Appropriations Committee as yet. There are many ways that the extra \$1 billion in cuts can be realized. Let me outline several examples. I have already set forth the \$10.6 billion of unobligated funds which the Defense Department will have at the end of the fiscal year '58. But I would now like to point out that \$3.5 billion of that amount will not even be committed to any type of project. It would certainly seem to me on that basis that a cut in defense funds considerably above the \$716 million suggested by the President would be in order. Furthermore, his suggested cut in Foreign Aid of \$500 million is \$450 million short of the average cut that has been applied over the past four years, as I have pointed out. In Agriculture the House has cut \$272 million over and above the \$254 million Soil Bank cut that the President suggested. A large proportion of that \$272 million cut can probably be sustained.

Stock Excuses Debunked

Finally, let me say a word to debunk the stock excuses we get on all sides for the proposed increases in the budget. The proposed expenditure for fiscal year '58 of \$71.8 billion is approximately \$6 billion above the actual spending for the fiscal year '56, which is the last completed fiscal year we have for comparison. Let's look at that proposed \$6 billion increase in the light of the three stock excuses. 1) Increased pay for federal civilian and armed forces employees. 2) Terribly expensive electronic implements of warfare. 3) Natural growth due to population increase. In brief, those three factors, when analyzed, account for less than \$1.5 billion of the \$6 billion increase, even though full weight is given to them without reduction for compensating factors.

The tide is at present running in favor of those who desire economy

but there are powerful forces at work and the proponents of big government and big spending are reinforcing and regrouping their forces. The hardest part of the battle is still ahead. The eventual outcome of the battle lies in the hands of an alert, informed American public which will continue to make its views felt until they culminate in victory.

(Reprints of Senator Bridges' article are available at 15 cents each, 100 for \$10.00. Address Department R, NATIONAL REVIEW, 211 East 37th St., New York 16, N.Y.)

NATIONAL TRENDS

(Continued from p. 492)

and the way to pare the budget is "to cut tax rates now [so as to make spending money unavailable]." And he was prepared to venture a guess as to why the GOP was not doing well on a nation-wide basis: "We are not presenting ourselves to Democrats and Independents as the party of less government." But neither Schoepel's own position, nor his guesses about the weather, were offered as guideposts for others. Budget-slashing, even anti-welfarism, might go over in Kansas; but not necessarily in New York. And whether such issues would go over in New York was for local New York organizations, and local New York candidates, to decide.

The conservatives in Congress, in other words, are not ready for an all-out challenge to "modern Republicanism." They have persuasive evidence, they think, that the rank-and-file, or some of them at any rate, are against certain facets of modern Republicanism; notably, heavy federal spending, large-scale foreign aid, subservience to the UN.

Strategy for 1958

The strategy is to exploit what dissatisfaction there is by giving it breathing room on the issues and in the places where it is festering.

The purpose is to make the 1958 congressional elections a proving-ground for those conservative tenets that now seem to have popular appeal.

The hope is that the test will come off well enough to warrant basing a

Presidential campaign in 1960 on, among others, some rightist principles—well enough, that is, to encourage big Republican money to get behind Senator Knowland.

Talk of a general right-wing revival, at this time, is nonsense. No one knows this better than Senator Knowland. He is well aware that the current "reaction" is founded on isolated issues, that at present it signifies very little of moment, very little about the electorate's over-all appraisal of the welfare state, or of the wisdom of appeasing, and seeking a permanent *modus vivendi* with, the Soviet Union. But Knowland is prepared to stake everything on the "isolated issues" because he also knows that Americans do not vote ideologies. Assuming the political scene is not dominated by a mesmerizing "personality," the isolated issue is what catches the voter's eye, and the trick is to run like hell with it if it happens to favor your side.

Knowland's hopes rest 1) on continued Administration obduracy on the issues over which he and other conservatives are now making some hay—spending, foreign aid, and to a degree, the UN—and the prospects here are promising; and 2) on a favorable, *documentable* response to those issues on the part of the electorate in 1958.

The People Spoke

The reason the future looked so gloomy for conservatives last November is that the election left no documentation of the conservative sentiments that were alleged to reside somewhere in the land. Without some concrete evidence that the President's victory did not mean what he said it did—a vindication of modern Republicanism—Republican leaders in Congress could not chance a rebellion. But such evidence—provoked in the main by the Eisenhower Doctrine's invasion of congressional rights, by the budget, by the Administration's foreign aid proposals, and by Knowland's stand on the UN—was soon forthcoming in the form of mail and personal reports to congressmen from the people back home. On the strength of those protests, the conservatives ventured forth—not necessarily to do battle, but to see if one could be arranged.

The Hiss Maneuver

Early last week, NATIONAL REVIEW wired a few people for brief comments on the following question: "ANALYZED FROM THE STANDPOINT OF BOLSHEVIK TACTICAL METHODS, WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE TO BE THE PRIMARY POLITICAL OBJECTIVE SOUGHT BY THE APPEARANCE OF THE ALGER HISS BOOK AT THIS TIME?" We sought comments from persons whose experience and training qualify them to speak knowingly of the ways of the Communist underworld. Herewith their replies:

James Burnham; Editor, NATIONAL REVIEW. Former Trotskyite. Author, *The Struggle for the World*, etc.

Alger Hiss' book is presumptive evidence that he has not broken with his past. His personal objective in writing and exploiting it may well be to regain acceptance by the international apparatus which, by the usual rules of the profession, doubtless withdrew from contact when he was caught and apparently of no further use.

Success in this Operation Comeback could demonstrate that Hiss and the Hiss Case still have a role to play in the destruction of the main enemy—that is, of the United States. There is a partial parallel in the career of Louis Fraina (Lewis Corey), who for some years after the apparatus cut him off, and before his own subjective break with Communism, was obsessed by the wish to be "vindicated" in the eyes of his Comrades. Hiss, like Corey, will most probably be disappointed. The apparatus is able to gain maximum benefits from the Hiss actions without re-establishing direct relations. After all, it is far better for the Party that books and lectures aiding in their consequences the Soviet cause should be sponsored by Alfred Knopf and Princeton than by Communist fronts.

Anthony T. Bouscaren; Chairman, Department of Political Science, Marquette University. Author, *Imperial Communism*:

The Communists are to storm the beaches following the Hiss book artillery barrage if sufficient doubts on his verdict can be raised. The entire anti-Communist effort is vulnerable. The Communist objective is to recreate the Popular Front, based on cadres

of the Progressive Party. The newly created American Forum for Socialist Education is a starter for a coalition of all Marxists, pacifists, neutralists, left-wing Catholics and civil libertarians. The general counterattack seeks to discredit legislative investigation and the security program, abolish nuclear tests, gain recognition for Red China and, with the help of the American Assembly, pro-Hiss and anti-Chambers elements, to revive the balmy days of 1935 to 1939 and 1945 to 1947.

A Communist counterattack may be expected in labor, education, mass media and government. The recent midwest conference of political scientists featured T. A. Bisson, Mulford Sibley and other collaborationists as speakers. Fred Schuman is already rehabilitated. American colleges are to feature Polish Communist professors next fall. Major penetration of the colleges is already under way. McCarthy's death gives added impetus and courage to the Liberals, who quieted down after the Hiss verdict. The Hiss book and the Popular Front give new respectability to Communists and pro-Hiss Liberals; also to the Soviet Union and Red China.

Jay Lovestone; Executive Secretary, Free Trade Union League, Labor League for Human Rights. One-Time Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Moscow is trying desperately to make itself respectable in the eyes of American and other Western public opinion. This is all the more urgent for the Soviet rulers and their followers and agents abroad because the Communist movement lost an enormous amount of ground as a result of the Hungarian Democratic Revolution of October 1956. It is part of the

Soviet strategy to break the moral and political quarantine which was almost instinctively and spontaneously applied against Communists in the free world after the Soviet war lords showed their hand in Hungary.

The publication of the Hiss book at this time, the appearance of Gates at a metropolitan college forum, the organization of the new Communist-concocted outfit calling itself The American Forum for Socialist Education, are all part of the same strategy.

It is pitiful to see so many in the democratic camp ready to play into the Kremlin's hands, ready to help its agents and agencies, to overcome the political ostracism and condemnation which the Soviet savagery in Hungary brought to international Communism.

Hede Massing; at present with Friends of Budapest. One-time head of a Soviet spy ring in the U.S. Testified at Hiss trial to having known Hiss as a Communist. Author, *This Deception*.

I have no knowledge of, or notion regarding, the timing of Alger Hiss' book from the standpoint of Bolshevik strategy. I knew Alger Hiss as a Communist back in 1935. After meeting him, I told my Russian boss I had for the first time come across a genuine American Bolshevik—so struck was I by his singlemindedness, his internal coldness, and the compulsiveness of his ideology. Nevertheless, I could not hate him—on the contrary. I was much taken by his charm—and do not now. On reading his book, however, I am dismayed by the realization that he is himself, first of all, a hater. He is totally lacking in respect for truth, or inclination to decency. He lies uninhibitedly, smoothly. He exhibits a delight in the perversion of truth, as also in the persecution of Chambers and myself, and others involved in his apprehension. He has become a perfect product of Sovietism.

J. B. Matthews; one-time secretary the American League for Peace and Democracy (a Communist front); later chief investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In Bolshevik parlance the word "convicted" is a synonym for the

word "framed." A Communist defendant in a capitalist court is innocent by definition, not only until proven guilty but afterwards as well. Some Communists establish their innocence by jumping eleven stories. Others, like Hiss, prefer to jump eleven chapters. The eggheads are jumping with him. Objective sought: snarl all future prosecution of Soviet agents.

Frank S. Meyer; Associate Editor, NATIONAL REVIEW. Active Member of the Communist Party, 1941-45.

In the Communist strategical plan, the function of the publication of Alger Hiss' book seems to me to be:

1. To destroy whatever understanding still exists among Americans, since the censure of McCarthy, of a) the interrelationship between the ideologies of Liberalism and Communism, and b) the presence of an organized Communist core at the heart of the Liberal establishment. In Communist jargon, "to raise the anti-McCarthyite campaign to a new and higher level."

2. To attempt, through the personal rehabilitation of Hiss, to vindicate the New Deal, United Nations, and pro-Yalta figures and policies which have been compromised by their association with Hiss; a maneuver, which if it should succeed, would greatly aid the current coexistence campaign directed towards destruction of the American will to fight.

3. To destroy the character of Whittaker Chambers, the man whom neither Communists nor Liberals can ever forgive for putting an end to Liberal "innocence."

Herbert A. Philbrick; now with the *New York Herald Tribune*. For several years an FBI agent inside the Communist Party. Author of *I Led Three Lives*.

Alger Hiss' book seeks to prove that:

- the FBI indulges in the practice of fabricating evidence;

- Federal judges would be a party to a frameup;

- fear of Communism has become "so great and unreasoning" as to reverse constitutional provisions.

The Hiss book is not a defense but an attack. And in every important aspect the attack coincides with the

continuing propaganda campaign waged by the Communist conspiracy.

The charges are made at the very time when the Communist International has stepped up its campaign of vilification. Truly important to the Communists is the hope that the contents of the *Daily Worker* will become deodorized by being repackaged in a hard-bound book.

Richard Rovere; Washington Correspondent of the *New Yorker*; Liberal critic and author, *The Eisenhower Years*, etc.

I cannot respond to the question as propounded. I assume the book was written because Alger Hiss thought he had something to say and published because Alfred Knopf thought Hiss deserved a hearing. I cannot imagine any Bolshevik boss in his senses thinking that anything political was to be gained by the publication of this book at this time. Evidently Hiss himself has little hope of convincing anyone in the court of public opinion, as presently constituted, that he was wronged: he says as much and goes on to say that he is hoping to engage the sympathies of those "who will in the future give their attention to the case."

In 1948 I thought it probable that Hiss was guilty, and in 1950 I felt it was established beyond a reasonable doubt. I hasten to point out that a "reasonable doubt" is not the same thing as "any possible doubt," and I have entertained some doubts that have seemed to me within the realm of possibility but not far enough within it to justify anyone in putting aside what appeared the one interpretation that fitted the known facts—i.e., that Chambers was telling to the best of his recollection what passed between himself and Hiss between 1936 and 1938.

Nothing in Hiss' book leads me to alter the view I have held all along. I must say, though, that I now find Hiss a somewhat more complex character than I did before. His book leaves me convinced, on the one hand, that he was guilty more or less as charged and, on the other, that he regards himself as innocent. I can only say that I hope that Mr. Robert Penn Warren will reflect on this and see if he can bring Alger Hiss to life. Alger Hiss hasn't done it.

Ralph de Toledano; Associate Editor of *Newsweek*. Co-author, *Seeds of Treason*.

Had the Hiss book persuaded anyone beyond Morris Ernst, it could have undermined confidence in American jurisprudence, in the FBI, and in the integrity of the anti-Communist fight. The outcry from the party's sleeper apparatus would have been deafening in behalf of the Rosenbergs, the other atom spies, the Smith Act convicts, and the Communists so painfully ousted from the State Department. The terrible defeat suffered by international Communism in Hungary could have been converted into a smashing victory for Soviet propaganda. And from that point on, accusation of Communist loyalty would, after the practice of the *Washington Post*, be proof positive of 100 per cent Americanism.

What man then would dare raise his voice against the Soviet Fifth Column? Even so feeble and preposterous a book, packed with over eighty (80) falsifications of the trial record, has been an occasion for Liberal prestidigitators to charge that though Hiss was guilty the FBI and Whittaker Chambers were corrupt. A convincing Hiss book would have been worth ten divisions to Khrushchev.

Bertram D. Wolfe; free lance writer. Former Communist. Author, *Three Who Made a Revolution*, etc.

When a man is publicly caught in a breach of trust (betrayal of those who had confidence in him, those who sponsored his appointment; betrayal of his country; and even of his friend Chambers who went to great lengths to try to save him), it is as hard for him to repent as it would be to expect sincere repentance from Dave Beck. Yet his usefulness to the Communist movement and the Soviet spy ring is ended by his exposure, except in one respect: He can still try to throw the shadow of doubt on the American system of justice, with its safeguards of libel law, due process, habeas corpus, independent judiciary, trial by jury, burden of proof, right of successive appeals—all of which safeguards are lacking in Iron Curtain countries. That is what his book tries to do.

The Law and the Spirit

A friend who walked much of the way with Whittaker Chambers recalls the early days of the Hiss case. She, too, is a witness

GRACE LUMPKIN

In August 1948, when Whittaker Chambers began his testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I was not unduly disturbed; nor did I reckon that anything would happen except that a majority of the American people would be grateful to him for pointing out the dangers which surrounded them.

At that time I was living in the parish house of my church in New York City and, each time elections came along, voting the straight Democratic ticket. My life seemed to be going along smoothly, and I had no way of knowing that there was going to be a profound upheaval in a number of directions. That upheaval began during Christmas week 1948, when I spent long hours with one of the Hiss lawyers, McLean, and the detective who had been hired by the Hiss defense.

Those who have read Whittaker Chambers' *Witness* may recall my connection with that wonderful family. But there was one thing Whittaker did not mention in his book: a great debt that I owe him.

It is difficult to explain to those who have not been closely connected for years with the Communists the existence of a separate and distinct Communist world within the ordinary world in which we live. Although I was never a member of the Communist Party I lived in that world more truly than most of those in intellectual circles who were actual card-carrying members. In that world one looks only to the future. The past has no reality, and the present is used only to promote the future.

For example, to us religion was an outmoded custom that the higher civilization which Communism would bring in would finally eliminate. In its more savage states the human animal had needed a God or gods, but we, the superior beings, had out-

grown such a low estate. We had become accustomed to viewing church buildings with commiseration and pity for those outdated structures and the deceived people who entered them. Usually they did not impinge on our consciousness at all. We were living in another world. It was therefore a great shock to us when we learned that Whittaker Chambers had "gone religious" and become a member of a church. I wouldn't believe it.

Soon he was at our home and told us it was true. Contrary to my expectations he seemed fresh, made over, new, and there was a quality of



joy about him that intrigued me. At the same time I pitied him with the pity of those who realize their superiority to superstition.

I was not allowed to remain long in that attitude. Whittaker came back again and again to urge me to re-examine my prejudice against religion. Somewhere along the line the things he said began to penetrate. And as they did I became unhappy, resentful and disturbed. Each time he urged me to think about religion, the unhappiness and distress mounted, until one day I ordered him out of the house. But he came back.

In 1941 I did find God; just as he

had promised I would. But the transition from Communism to Christianity is not so easy as it sounds. Communist thinking can be changed to Christian thinking only through a series of acts of the individual will that freely and spontaneously deliver the heart, the soul and the mind to God. The most difficult to deliver is the mind. I have noted this in others as I noted it in myself—that the majority of Christians may love the Lord God with all their hearts and souls, but they will not love Him with their minds. My mind is my own—so they seem to say; the United Nations is ours, we built it, God must not touch it, they seem to say; my politics are my own, they seem to say. I think Whittaker Chambers had a simpler time making the transition because he did, at once, deliver his heart, his soul and his mind.

When Whittaker Chambers began his testimony before the congressional committee, it was easy for me to believe what "my" political party said: that all the furor was merely a move by the "conservative" Republicans to discredit the "progressive" Democrats. But, though I disagreed with Whittaker Chambers politically, I had complete faith in him and an understanding of what he was trying to do.

Early in the fall of 1948 I wrote to him expressing this faith. But (and even now I blush as I recall my ignorance and naiveté) I also said I was glad that we did not at once condemn Alger Hiss (as would happen in a similar situation in the Soviet Union) but were trying to be fair to him.

As the weeks went on I saw with mounting wonder and dismay that the Democrats and their newspapers, instead of welcoming the truth Whittaker Chambers was giving to our country, were condemning and smearing him. I was reminded, as the smears continued, of a certain

group of women I had known within the unions of the garment and fur trades. Along Seventh Avenue, between 28th Street and 34th, during the "season," a great assemblage of men and women came out on both sides of Seventh Avenue at lunch time. Many of them were members of the Communist Party. Here, if any person had displeased the Communists by some political act, or some speech within a union, a group of women from the Party surrounded that man on the crowded sidewalk at lunch time. Because of the crowd he was unable to move, and, one at a time, the women would spit on him, not one of them losing her zest or ammunition. They were called the "spitting squad."

On Wednesday evening after Christmas 1948, after having dinner with a friend, I returned to the parish house where I was living and was told by my rector that two men, a lawyer and a representative of the FBI, had called on me to ask some questions about Whittaker Chambers. He asked me if I would see them. I said that I would and he made the appointments with them. I thought that the lawyer and the FBI representative were coming to give me an opportunity to tell what I knew, and I was only too glad to have that opportunity.

I was astonished, then, the following Thursday—the day of my appointment with the detective—when we had sat down together in the rector's study, that the first thing he said to me was: "We would like you to tell us everything possible that we could use to discredit Whittaker Chambers."

I looked at him in astonishment. "Are you a member of the FBI?" I asked.

He explained that he had been with the FBI but at present was a private detective, and that he had been retained by "many prominent men in the government and out" who had contributed money for the Hiss defense. Still he seemed to believe that I was ready to help them. I could not understand it, and do not understand it to this day.

"I'll tell you the truth," I said.

The detective had asked for an hour. He stayed three. Along with answering many questions I told him about my debt to Whittaker Cham-

bers when, in 1939, he had helped me to find God.

At the end of three hours he said: "You have convinced me that Hiss is guilty and that Whittaker Chambers is telling the truth. And though I am receiving a large amount of money for this work I want you to know that I am going to resign. When Mr. McLean comes to interview you tomorrow, I hope you will tell him all that you have told me."

The interview with McLean, next day, lasted for two and a half hours. I answered his questions, which were all directed toward finding something that would discredit Whittaker Chambers. McLean seemed at every point and in subtle ways to be trying to trap me. The only reason he was not able to do so was that I was telling him the truth.

As the hours went by, and he asked questions and I answered them, a sad and bitter fact was forced upon me: This was not a matter of the Republicans using Whittaker Chambers for political reasons; rather it was the Communists using the Democrats.

Late in 1949, in a last desperate effort to reach what I believed was a tolerant and unprejudiced if ignorant mind (ignorant of the true situation in connection with Whittaker Chambers), I wrote a long letter to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. I told her in detail why I knew he was telling the truth.

In order to give her confidence in what I had to say I gave her my own background and reminded her that my brother had met her husband, when he was President, at Mr. Baruch's plantation near Charleston; that her husband had appointed my

brother Federal Judge in South Carolina and had personally persuaded him to take the office, although my brother had not wished to become a judge. I reminded her that in 1935 she had come to see a play made from a novel I had written.

I waited hopefully. Mrs. Roosevelt had taken a decided stand against prejudice and for tolerance. And though I realized I could expect no passionate indignation from her, I did expect, with the truth given her as I had given it, a reasonable recognition that prejudice and intolerance had been Whittaker Chambers' portion from the beginning, and that she would stand for truth against falsehood (once she was made acquainted with the truth), no matter what it might do to her position in her political party and among the Communists.

After sending the letter I looked each day in Mrs. Roosevelt's column, "My Day," for a change in her attitude toward Whittaker Chambers. It did not come. Her championship of Alger Hiss continued.

Then I received the following note:

Val-Kill Cottage
Hyde Park, Dutchess County
New York

Dear Miss Lumpkin:

I am returning your enclosures as I think we will have to leave this case to those involved.

Very sincerely yours,
(signed) ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

Two days (I think it was) after I received this communication there appeared in "My Day" a smear against Whittaker Chambers. Later there was another in that column, and then another.

At that point I needed a greater wisdom than my own to resolve my bitterness and confusion. At that point I went into my church one day and gave my *mind* as well as my heart and soul to God, wholly and completely. I sat in the church for a long time, taking each conviction I had retained, and presenting it to God so that His wisdom might revise, purify and give it direction.

It was a painful experience, but when I came out of the church I was no longer filled with bitterness and confusion. I knew where I stood. Whittaker Chambers had done more than either he or I could expect or know when, in 1939, he had come to me and said: "You must find God."

"The End of McCarthy"

As NATIONAL REVIEW is unable to fill the many requests for the May 18 issue, we are making available reprints of all the material on Senator McCarthy at 25¢ for a single set, \$15 per 100. This set includes Mr. Schlamm's article "Across McCarthy's Grave" (available separately, 15¢ each, \$10 per 100), and the editorial "The End of McCarthy" with articles by Mr. Bozell and Mr. Jones (available separately, 20¢ each, \$12.50 per 100).

THE IVORY TOWER

WM. F. BUCKLEY, JR.

Why Princeton?

I have maintained that college graduates should, over the years, repay their alma mater the cost of educating them. My premises were, simply, that *someone* has to pay the bills, that the government should not, and that to distribute the bills among those who incur them is just; and it is a fact that if payment is made over a period of time, say twenty years, the burden is tolerable.

Well, the colleges of the land have a way of disregarding my advice; thus they continue to appeal to the alumnus not by a call upon him to discharge his duty, but by diffuse appeals to his loyalty to his old school, and to higher education in general.

What, exactly, is the nature of that loyalty? Take Princeton: why is an alumnus expected to give money to Princeton? One reason persistently advanced in the literature of fund-raising is that Princeton (read Yale, Harvard, University of Chicago, etc.) deserves support because at Princeton education is dispensed by first-rate scholars, and this state of affairs should continue. But the fact is that the first-rate scholars at Princeton exist, are first-rate, and will continue to exist, be first-rate, and teach, independently of whether the alumnus gives a penny to Princeton. What Princeton fund-raisers are really saying in this connection is not so much that without the generous support of the alumni the first-rate professors will not be able to teach, but that they will not, without that support, be able to teach at Princeton. The rhetoric of alumni appeals is wonderfully hurried and grand on these matters. The call is implicitly upon sentiment; explicitly the alumnus is asked to serve the educational muse. Yet if appeals to the alumni were actually based on the needs of education—in abstractu—the money would be solicited in behalf of more stricken areas than Princeton, N. J.

Let the patron of Princeton be well

aware that if he is any way responsible for luring Professor X away from Stanford, he is, in addition to being responsible for the benefit inuring to students at Princeton, also responsible for the loss sustained by students at Stanford. There is no net evil in the transaction, heaven knows. But is there, *sub specie aeternitatis*, a net gain to the cause of higher education?

The effect of a gift to Princeton is, then, simply, to improve Princeton's competitive position *vis à vis* other universities. There is a lot to say for doing that. But the donor to Princeton, if anyone gets around to being direct with him, will have a rough time sublimating his gift in terms of sheer, dispassionate altruism. For he is, in fact, merely up to the same kind of thing, at a more refined level, as those other alumni who donate their energies to scouring the countryside for agile hulks who can pass, block, and tackle.

Quid Pro Quo

My point is this: one tends to give to one's alma mater with something other in mind than the general improvement of society through higher education. The alumnus approves of Princeton (to stay with the *corpus vile*) as a carrier of standards, institutions and traditions of which, for one reason or another, he approves. Still, why make sacrifices to preserve Princeton's educational primacy and Princeton's character? For one of two reasons: a) the duty I have mentioned ("Princeton did something for me; I shall do something for her"), a factor much understressed in the rhetoric of alumni appeals; and b) the desire to assure the survival of a college which will in due course bequeath its benefits to his son and grandsons.

The egalitarian passions of the day have caused the administrators of

almost every college in the country to forswear favoritism for the sons of graduates. For some reason, it has become virtuous to proclaim that only intellectual attainment and general character will be weighed in determining whether to admit an applicant. I have an idea that, *sub rosa*, a number of colleges weigh a thing or two more besides. I have a feeling that John Hay Whitney the Sixteenth will make Yale even if he has two heads, and that provided the tribe does not continue to increase at quite the present rate, the heirs of FDR will matriculate at Harvard for a good many years to come. But the sons of the majority of graduates are in for it; and particularly now, when applicants in large numbers are beating at the doors of institutions dominated by Jacobinical abstractions about equality. The result is that the son of a Princeton man who, by his conduct, devotion and sacrifice has become a part of the larger, non-resident, community of Princeton, ends up with a lesser claim upon Princeton than any other accidental applicant who might have done a little better in trigonometry at high school.

It is a plain fact that a number of colleges in this country, and they include the nation's leading colleges, were not designed to be, and have not in the past been administered as, lacunae of what Russell Kirk would call defecated intellectuality. They have been intellectual communities first; but also social and traditionalist communities through which intelligent and responsible members of the elite have been able to pass on a common cultural experience to their heirs without being anathematized as antisocial or undemocratic. This is not to say that sons of alumni ought to have preemptive rights to admission to the alma mater. Reasonable entrance requirements should be met; and the alumni themselves, anxious not to depreciate their school, would be the first to agree. But alumni are entitled to ask—and to arrive at an understanding on the matter before they decide whether to support Princeton in particular or education in general—that their sons, other things being more or less equal, be acknowledged by Princeton as favorite sons.

ARTS and MANNERS

WILLIAM S. SCHLAMM

Notes on a Farmer's Daughter

Eugene O'Neill's *A Moon for the Misbegotten*, unmistakably a *Tobacco Road* for the literate set, is a far better play than his *Long Day's Journey Into Night*. Therefore, naturally, it has gathered recently far worse reviews in the metropolitan press—naturally, I say, because the reigning Atkinsonian criticism is tasteless.

A year ago, when *Long Day's Journey Into Night* began its journey smack into the Pulitzer Prize, the Establishment was in extreme need of some literary glory. Several unspeakably dreary theater seasons had passed without the feeblest reason (say, a new Truman Capote) to jubilate; and even though the Liberals know little about the nature of man, they do understand that, to conform politically, man must feel proud of his civilization. So, from year to year, the Establishment has either to present or to invent a genius. Last year, however, there was nobody around but a buried man. He had to do, he and the poorest play he had ever written.

In the judgment of a saner posterity, *Long Day's Journey* will be explained, though not excused, as the collapse of creativity in an otherwise important writer. A greatly exhausted O'Neill, obsessed with the averagely sordid history of his family, tried to purge himself of the obsession—and failed because he had attained neither insight nor compassion. *Long's Day's Journey* is a worse than mediocre play because its author, in this case, was a mediocre thinker and a worse than mediocre lover.

But *A Moon for the Misbegotten* is moved by the author's love for one of his creations, Josie Hogan (fully understood and masterfully played by Miss Wendy Hiller). She was animated by what alone turns a writer into a dramatist—his fascination with the demons in a driven person's soul. Josie, a farmer's daughter, wants to give herself to the same James Tyrone

who, in *Long Day's Journey*, personified the decadence of the O'Neill family. Caught here several years even after the unholy decomposition of *Long Day's Journey*, James Tyrone is the walking corpse of a prurient man. All he wants from Josie is that she be as pure and comforting as his dead mother. Josie obliges. But, as she learns to accept a world which she will never understand, and while her heart breaks, we have fallen in love with the unloved Josie.

O'Neill has here lived up to a playwright's fundamental commitment—to compel an audience's passionate participation in the fate of his creatures. The four Tyrones, in *Long Day's Journey*, leave us cold. Why? Because O'Neill liked none of them, not even the youngest Tyrone who was himself. There were no demons, no angels, no devils to keep them going. In *Long Day's Journey*, O'Neill was only the sterile epigone of Europe's *fin de siècle* debunkers. But in *A Moon for the Misbegotten* he looked into the tragic harlequinade of human existence with the curiosity of the creative dramatist. Josie is a person who, once met, will remain within your life experience.

A Moon for the Misbegotten is a worthy (though by no means great) play of a serious dramatist. Consequently it was rejected by the critics who swooned over *A Hole in the Head* and extorted the Pulitzer Prize for O'Neill's poorest play. To give them their due, those critics were consistent in their tastelessness: the only figure and performance in *A Moon for the Misbegotten* which they unanimously praised was James Tyrone in a rather maudlin performance by Mr. Franchot Tone. Just let a man move and talk in the brittle stupor that goes for cleverness at Toots Shor's, and New York's critics feel entirely at home. They didn't quite get the joke O'Neill had to tell about this particular farmer's daughter, but they sure got James Tyrone's wise-cracks.

When the play ends, James Tyrone

walks off (toward Broadway, I presume, where he will have many another drink in smart company), while Josie stays on the farm to till the land and to enchant my imagination. Everybody in the end gets what is coming to him and her. Which is exactly how a worthy play should end.

....and a Lady

On March 9 I said on this page, in a fit of gloom, "that I didn't need to be embarrassed for the ladies in the audience. They enjoyed every smutty remark. . . . They're clearly the worldlier sex. We seem to be moving toward a new and nicely inverted Double Standard, under which you will watch your language when gentlemen are present."

Moving? My eye! A few weeks later, I looked at the May 2 issue of the *Reporter* and read over the signature of Miss Marya Mannes: "Absent from commercial television are the two ingredients in which an adult audience might find its truest relaxation: wit and sex." Sex—absent from our TV!

Now I met Miss Mannes many years ago and I remember her as a handsome and highly civilized lady. What devil drove her to make this fantastic statement, I cannot imagine. As I am wary of being suspected of prudishness, I shall quote what the Liberal TV editor of the *New York Post* (the *Reporter's* daily edition) had to say (on May 6, 1957) about the notorious omnipresence of sex on TV: "It [TV] will permit the outright invitation to sex to be extended to children."

Just possibly, Miss Mannes doesn't mean by "sex" what the rest of us mean. What makes this conceivable is her complaint—in the *Reporter*!—about the absence of wit: Did "wit," to her, mean what it means to us, the gracious lady would certainly not have made her editor so miserably self-conscious. On the other hand, I remember that same editor, Professor Max Ascoli, as a worldly scholar and a gallant gentleman. Surely he would not have permitted a lady to use dangerous words, publicly, in innocent ignorance. So, to everybody's regret, Miss Mannes' fantastic statement will have to stand. Gentlemen, please, will leave.

BOOKS IN REVIEW

One-Up on Everybody

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

Stephen Potter, an Englishman with a long upper lip which is never quite stiff enough to conceal a faintly derisive attitude, is the twentieth century's revenge for Tom Brown of Rugby. In a series of books (*Gamesmanship*, *Lifemanship*, *One-Upmanship*) he has taught a large and increasingly articulate following the art of putting one's opponent, or one's boss, or even one's wife or husband, firmly and inextricably behind the eight-ball. As Potter has worked it out, there is always a way of winning without actually violating the rules. He has given an English spin to something which Leo Durocher, erstwhile manager of the New York Giants, learned on the sandlots of Springfield, Mass.—that “nice guys finish last.”

Well, a game is only a game, and all that, and there's no reason to pretend that you're sorry for an opponent when he's thrown out of the ball park because you've succeeded in making him mad. The only danger is that the “gambits” and “ploys” of “one-upmanship” inevitably render their employer a marked man. Leo Durocher found that out when Commissioner Happy Chandler bounced him out of his managerial job for nothing more tangible than being “one up” too often on too many people.

With his whole career of making a living by bringing out the worst in everybody against him, how can Stephen Potter expect an innocent reading for his travel book, *Potter on America* (Random House, \$3)? In frequent passages of his diary of two visits to this country in 1955 Mr. Potter protests that he loves America. I have no doubt that he does, in his fashion. But whether he loves it or hates it, he can't resist the temptation to be “one up” on it whenever the opportunity presents itself.

There is the little matter of art appreciation, for example. Mr. Potter, in the course of fulfilling lecture engagements from Washington, D. C., to Eugene, Oregon, stayed in a number of private homes. He enjoyed being a guest, but it is always with an air of shocked surprise that he records the presence of a good painting hanging on an American drawing room wall. “How,” so Mr. Potter asks in Chicago, “how did he acquire the Picasso

drawings and the Klee etchings and water colors?” The answer would seem to be obvious: anybody can buy a Picasso if he knows about him and has the money. But by raising the faintest shadow of a doubt about the appreciation of good painting in Chicago Mr. Potter has made his point. He has gone “one up” in culture on the barbarians who live within a whiff of the stockyards.

Mr. Potter, though he prefers French cuisine, enjoyed eating and drinking everywhere he went. But, horror of horrors, he couldn't find places in America to play squash and sweat out that feeling of being constantly overstuffed. The inference is that Americans don't know about the purgative joys of exercise. “One up” on us in this matter, Mr. Potter drops a superior remark to the effect that “they are much more diet-conscious than exercise-conscious here.” Yet, on an October day in Central Park, the same Mr. Potter can mention the presence of five hundred skaters on the nearby ice rink. Are we to infer from this that skating isn't exercise,

or merely that Mr. Potter has slipped a bit? For that matter, almost anybody could have told Mr. Potter where to find a squash court.

In Canton, Ohio, Mr. Potter goes one up on the folks by remarking that McKinley's tomb is “three times the size of the Invalides.” The answer to this, which proves nothing beyond the point that bad taste is universal, is that the Albert Memorial isn't so hot, either.

At home Mr. Potter is a botanizer. His one-up gambit which clearly establishes his superiority to Americans in the matter of appreciating nature is to express delight on discovering a “plant man” in Oregon (italics are Mr. Potter's). If Mr. Potter thinks “plant men” are rare on these shores, he had better consult John Kieran or sit in on a few garden club lectures. As for the alleged lack of “bird watchers” in America, Mr. Potter might reflect on the peculiar fact that it was an exchange about a prothonotary warbler that enabled Whittaker Chambers to prove to the legislators that he had indeed known Alger Hiss.

Mr. Potter is genuinely appreciative of such things as New Orleans jazz, big league baseball, the golf swing of Sammy Snead, baked Columbia River salmon, college students who get his jokes the first time, the desert scenery of Arizona, the swimming pools at Las Vegas, the clear-cut character of American football, the strange industrial architecture of a Standard Oil refinery. He is scornful of Deweyite progressive education, particularly as it manifests itself in the lower grades, and he dislikes Americans who, in the words of D. H. Lawrence, suffer from “sex in the head.” When the “one up” note is forgotten, his book has a freshness that is even, at times, ingenuous. But Mr. Potter cannot get away from his conditioning for very long. One result is that even when he thinks he is defending America from the criticism of Englishmen of the Kingsley Martin-New

Statesman and Nation stripe, he is, in reality, going "one up" on everybody, Englishmen and Americans included.

His remarks on the English reaction to "McCarthyism" is a distinct case in point. To prove to Bertrand Russell and his friends that America has its "Lincoln-minded men" as well as its "Kingfish sprats," Mr. Potter notes that during his two 1955 trips to this country the McCarthy "terror" no longer had people hiding in holes. He also found it worth mentioning that "early Chaplin" films could be seen. "I am glad," he says, "that the cloud which hangs, here, over Chaplin's reputation has put no stop to Chaplin revivals."

This strikes us as Mr. Potter's way of telling his English friends that Americans have, indeed, stopped beating their wives. But nowhere does Mr. Potter turn up an actual instance of wife-beating in 1951, when he insists that the "McCarthyite"

scourge did have people hiding from hysteria and terror. Mr. Potter thinks that the "screening" of creative artists in Hollywood did result in injustices in 1951. The nature of the injustices, and the innocent characters are, however, left conveniently unnamed.

As it turns out, Mr. Potter seems to have gotten his information from Herblock, the cartoonist of the *Washington Post*. Well, if that is looking at America with a fresh eye, then such characters as John Howard Lawson never did peddle the Communist line in films and Owen Lattimore was a fountain of good advice when he told us about those Chinese Jeffersonian agrarians. Mr. Potter offers a strange tribute to Lincoln when he implies that "Lincoln-mindedness" requires overlooking evidence that was plain as a pikestaff in 1951, and still is. But maybe that is merely Mr. Potter's way of going "one up" on the Great Emancipator himself.

Inside Orpheus

Art and Psychoanalysis, edited with an introduction by William Phillips. 552 pp. New York: Criterion Books. \$8.50.

Once a play was a play, pure and simple; an entertainment, a token of civilization, as detached from its creator as a cloak from a tailor. Whether he produced poems, songs, or pictures, Orpheus was regarded as a maker, not as a hero; his private life, his love affairs, his neuroses, were irrelevant. But by 1920, a frenzy of biographical revelation was under way. Everyone from Shakespeare to poor D. H. Lawrence was shaken down, until an inevitable reaction, calling itself the "new criticism," went to the opposite extreme of reading a poem as though it were only a verbal toy.

About the same time, professional and then amateur psychologists dignified their curiosity by formulating the issue in more "objective," methodological terms. "In what sense," they asked, "does neurosis have something to do with art?" and now, in a 500-page anthology, William Phillips has gathered some of their answers.

Predictably, I suppose, he has preferred non-poets to poets. This would be defensible if most of his 26 con-

tributors were not so perfunctorily uninspired, coming at their subjects as mechanically, as heartlessly, as uniformly, as so many night workers approaching turret lathes toolled up by Freud. Works of art, like dreams, are only "mechanisms" which, properly reamed, reveal hidden desires, etc. We read of Poe's "deep, infantile sources," of Swift's "anal stamp," of Kafka's "hypnagogic hallucinations." Apart from Empson's grandly loony cadenza on Dodgson's Alice, and Edmund Wilson's well-known study of Philoctetes' wound and his bow, the only pages that are not depressing are by Trilling and Leslie Fiedler. Otherwise, I kept remembering what Rilke said about psychoanalysis as early as 1912: "Something perilously akin to a disinfected soul is the result."

Of course, what most of Mr. Phillips' commentators would have in common is an uneasiness about the word "soul." As a synonym for ego, it would be usable. But as Rilke meant it, as the source inside a man by which the Kingdom of Heaven enters him, it would embarrass them. I wonder if—excepting Fiedler—any of them could say, "God created men

For the POLITICALLY-MINDED MAN

LABOR UNION MONOPOLY

Fifty years ago the picture of the labor union as a weak idealistic organization of down-trodden workers had some basis in fact. Today there has been a complete reversal of the labor-union role. In this new book, Donald R. Richberg describes how misuse of power by labor bosses has become a clear and present danger to the nation and the labor movement itself. \$3.50.



THE GREAT GIVEAWAY



Aptly subtitled *The Realities of Foreign Aid*, this extraordinarily timely book tells the complete story of the way in which we have wasted billions of dollars in a futile attempt to buy peace and security. The author, Eugene W. Castle, gives facts and figures to fully document his contention that we need a complete re-evaluation of our entire foreign-aid program. \$3.50.



TITO Moscow's Trojan Horse

Here, documented and expertly analyzed, is the incredible story of "Titoism." Dr. Slobodan Draskovich tells the whole story of Tito's rise to power—his service to the Kremlin's plans for world domination—and the harm he has done to the West, to Hungary, and the cause of freedom everywhere. \$5.00.

THE SOVEREIGN STATES



James Jackson Kilpatrick discusses the entire history of States Rights, from the writing of the Constitution to the present day. He shows how the Federal Government has continually worked to wear down the legitimate authority of the States—and suggests possible means to halt this trend. \$5.00.

"Every citizen of the United States would do well to read and study this work."
—Senator Harry F. Byrd

At all bookstores
HENRY REGNERY COMPANY

64 East Jackson Blvd., Chicago 4, Ill.

and put souls in them," *tout court*, and not feel silly.

I am not saying this to be impatient. I think it is the crux of their oddly abortive inquiry. They talk about Orpheus and his "neuroses" as though a man were simply 1) a Conscious Self, and 2) an Unconscious Self, playing a not very enthusiastic game of hide-and-seek. What they never consider is the possibility that Orpheus—or any man—has another, a third point of issue beneath, if you like, the first two, by which he is entered, nutrified, and *lived*, just as a growing plant is entered and sustained by the earth. He differs from other men only in that his gift is for discovering himself with words, as someone else's might be for fatherhood, or shipbuilding, or teaching Latin. Then one day, his soul addresses him more or less as follows:

"Orpheus, you have been chosen to be a poet. You must now choose, in turn, either to be chosen, or to decline. If, like Christ, you say, 'Thy will be done,' then your first business will be to equip yourself with some sort of disability which will make a life of normal action impossible, and enable you to discharge your passion only in your work. A psychological or even a physical illness will do. Proust chose asthma. On the other hand, many poets—Yeats, Shakespeare, Tennyson—have managed to accomplish the same purpose by falling in love with an unattainable person. Whatever it is, accept its discipline as a monk accepts his habit. It will make your dedication a little easier, and sooner or later you will be able to get seriously to work.

"Of course, a good part of the time

you will be lonely, tired, and in doubt. People will misunderstand you; psychologists will speculate on the connection between your 'neurosis' and your writing; professors will make a living on you after you're dead. But that's all right. Just stick to your work, and never be afraid to offer your example as a man to anyone who asks for it. It will be imperfect and, since you are a passionate fellow, probably quite unsightly. You yourself may not get to Heaven. But you must always let your example be available, and vulnerable, to whomever else it may help to get there."

ROGER BECKET

Brilliant Economist

Common Sense Economics, by Albert Hahn. 244 pp. New York: Abelard-Schuman. \$4.50

In the two supposedly "non-socialist" camps of Western economists, the many Keynesians (with their intermural bickering) and the much fewer non-Keynesians (also bickering intermurally), L. Albert Hahn stands in the forefront among the non-Keynesians. Dr. Hahn is a Swiss banker turned economist, and in his earlier work, *The Economics of Illusion*, he admitted he was "a Keynesian before Keynes": in this book he set his economic writings of the 1920's against Keynes' "General Theory" of the 1930's; and the similarity was quite striking.

In his *Common Sense Economics*, Dr. Hahn again combines candor, insight and courage. He tells the sick alcoholic patients of the West that, if they are to avoid another attack of delirium tremens on the order of the Great Depression, they have to abandon the inflationary bottle. The boom, the wild night before, can only lead to the bust, the hangover of the morning after—and much worse. The inflationary orgy of the Germans during the twenties—which Dr. Hahn witnessed at first hand—is at least partly responsible for the emergence of Hitler out of the ruins of the German middle class. Thus the plot of Dr. Hahn's *Common Sense Economics* is simple enough: the cycle of boom and bust is not inherent in capitalism. Keynes and Marx to the contrary; depressions result from one cause—

inflation. Business cycles are, in Dr. Hahn's words, "alternating inflations and deflations"—the inevitable result of the governments' proclivity for deficit spending and the central banks' weakness for cheap money. The boom carries the seeds of the bust.

Unlike Keynes, and his emphasis on consumption, Dr. Hahn concentrates on production (as did the classical economists). He charges that the spending of inflated currency in the Keynesian scheme of things can only further twist prices and costs out of relation to each other.

Is it too late to turn back? Is a sharp recession lurking in the near future? The author is not sure and ends his book on a cautious note.

Common Sense Economics, though it requires some background in economic theory, is brilliant and incisive.

WILLIAM H. PETERSON

A Critics' Critic

Craft and Character, by Morton Dauwen Zabel. 331 pp. New York: The Viking Press. \$4.75

Mr. Morton Zabel, a critic whose leftist orientation only occasionally interferes with his analyses, takes the reader on a potentially fascinating tour of Victorian and modern novelists. He starts with three essays on Dickens, proceeding to Thomas Hardy in what is perhaps the best piece of the lot, then taking in Samuel Butler and Henry James. This concludes the first section of the book, subtitled "The Terms of the Appeal." The next part is devoted to "The Terms of the Response," beginning with a long and sometimes perceptive series on Conrad, then continuing through E. M. Forster, Ford Maddox Ford, Willa Cather, Graham Greene and various "Readings in Fiction" (including an acid and entirely justified attack on Somerset Maugham, an obeisance to Lionel Trilling's fiction dictated perhaps more by ideology than by criticism, and a competent summation of Hemingway).

I don't think the reader will find too many things to disagree with in this book—which implies, perhaps, a disappointment. We will lament in the series on Dickens (the weakest

To order any book reviewed in this book section, write:

THE BOOKMAILER

Box 101, Murray Hill Station
New York 16, N. Y.

Return mail service—postpaid
PAY ONLY BOOKSTORE PRICE

\$..... payment enclosed
Please send me:
(name of book)

Name

Address

(No C.O.D. orders accepted; payment
MUST accompany order N.Y. City residents add 3% tax)

portion) an overly sociological approach. We will renew our despair over the sterile tendency of modern criticism to waste pages in attack and riposte with other critics, sometimes entirely losing sight of the artist under discussion and the primary function of criticism; which is not to indulge in hopeless and extended debate on what are largely matters of taste or exegetical errors of minimal importance, but to apply a sensitive mind to an author's work and bring out by the interaction of the author's artistry and the critic's penetration some beauties (or faults) which the untrained eye is incapable of discovering. A critic should do more showing than debating (as a general and, of course, highly vulnerable rule).

Mr. Zabel often forgets this, and writes tracts for other critics to pick over. He is sometimes tediously tautological: when he seems to be making a new point one often finds that he is only indulging in a ritor-nello. Mr. Zabel has in a sense cheated the reader by abdicating from an author's responsibility to edit himself. But, despite its faults, his book is often illuminating.

F. R. BUCKLEY

Much to Learn

World Religions, by Benson Y. Landis. 158 pp. Dutton. \$2.95

This almost childish book is more apt to mislead than to instruct the reader. Its language is frequently a jargon that resembles the babbling of "educators." In the article on Buddhism, for example, we are told that *nirvana* "signifies a state of attaining to an expansion of personality," and that the reign of King Asoka "was marked by many constructive practices."

There are errors of fact and grotesque omissions. The article on Islam gives no hint that that religion has almost as many sects as Christianity, and does not even allude to the major doctrinal differences represented by the Sunnites, Shiites, Mutazilites, Sufis, and Ismailians. And if the author is, as the publisher's blurb has it, "a student of Roman Catholicism," he is a student who has much to learn.

REVILO OLIVER



When East Meets West
An intimate glimpse into the life of
Lafcadio Hearn's son . . . as he tells it in

RE-ECHO

BY KAZIO HEARN KOIZUMI

Edited by Nancy Jane Fellers and containing the last unpublished Lafcadio Hearn source material. The Japanese son of the great writer, Lafcadio Hearn, here presents a treasure book of lessons, thoughts, stories, and memories. The ghost of Lafcadio Hearn spans half a century to renew the bond of father and son, East and West. 161 pages, large 8vo, four-color frontispiece, four pages of colored plates (13 full-color illustrations), and numerous black and white illustrations from original drawings by Lafcadio Hearn. Limited Edition. \$10.00

" . . . a delicate, fragmentary, juvenile chrestomathy . . . designed to instruct, amuse, and morally strengthen the child—which they surely did . . . skillfully wrought . . . delightful . . . The preface deserves praise . . ."
Virginia Kirkus Service

Fortune Warns:

"If Mr. Morley is not careful, someone will propose a law that will make his book mandatory reading in all high schools and colleges. . . ." Still,

Felix Morley's GUMPTION ISLAND

is not yet compulsory. It is merely

Washington Star—"delightful"
Baltimore Sun—"rollicking"
Philadelphia Bulletin—"exciting"
Sat. Eve. Post—"pleasant"
National Review—"sheer reading fun"
All-American Books—"one of the best"
N. Bedford Stand. Times—"provocative"
Colo. Springs Telegraph—"tantalizing"
Annapolis Capital—"witty"

Selected by Walter Trohan, in the *Chicago Sunday Tribune*, as one of the ten most gift-worthy of current books. Complete with map of the Island, Chart of the sub-crustal magma and Decorative Dinosaur Jacket . . . \$5.00

OTHER SPRING BOOKS FROM CAXTON

HOLAND, CHESTER SCOTT

WHALE HUNTERS ABOARD THE GREY GOLD

A stimulating tale of an Indian youth aboard a New England whaleship. There are vivid descriptions of whale hunting, mutiny, and shipwreck, set against a background not usually found in sea tales. 140 pages, 20 pages of illustrations reproduced from old prints and photographs. \$4.00

KINGSBURY, RUTH FOOTE

LOOKOUT TOWER

Margaret Adams, eighteen, achieves one of her great ambitions—to serve for a summer as a Forest Service guard. With her brother Dick, fourteen, she mans Stampede Lookout Tower in the Snoqualmie National Forest near Puget Sound. For young people of high-school age. Illustrated by Ernest Norling. \$3.50

STARK, CHARLES R., JR.

THE BERING SEA EAGLE

A story about Harry L. Blunt, known to all Alaskans as the Bering Sea Eagle. Blunt was a U.S. Forest Service aerial fire spotter. Alas-

kan bush pilot, rescue flyer and trail blazer. He flew Father Hubbard, the famed Glacier Priest, on many of his errands of mercy. 170 pages, illustrated with 35 reproductions of photographs. \$5.00

TEAL, EVELYN

FLYING SNOWSHOES

The thrilling true story of John (Snowshoe) Thompson who for twenty years delivered, on snowshoes, the mail from Placerville, California to Genoa, Nevada. Chronicles his many adventures with wolves, Indians, starvation and freezing. Illustrated by David Hunt. \$4.00

LARRISON, EARL J.

OWYHEE: The Life of a Northern Desert

The story of the animals, plants, and other natural features of the Owyhee Desert of southwestern Idaho. It describes the abundant and varied life of the desert and how it is adapted to live in so difficult a place. Described also are man's early struggles in the desert. Locale: Owyhee County, Idaho. Period: 1824 to present. 350 pages, copiously illustrated by Don Fritts. \$5.00



CAXTON OF CALDWELL, IDAHO



Complete catalog #85 NR is yours for the asking

To the Editor

Marksmanship in World War III

As noted in your editorial of May 4, you are still tilting with windmills. . . . What have you fellows got against the Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice?

Your friend Mr. Shoemaker is being a bit facetious when he states that "the Indian hunting season is over." The Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice was started in the Presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, and the poor Indians had been subdued for a while, anyway. . . .

You are of the opinion that World War III is going to be all "push-button" stuff with guided missiles, super and trans-sonic planes, all with atomic war-heads or bombs. . . . A big portion of it will be like that, maybe, but there is still going to be lots for the infantryman with a rifle to accomplish. . . .

Ask the boys who fought in Korea what shot at them. It was either Communist riflemen, or artillerymen, and they were on the ground firing more or less conventional armament. . . . This last week the Army adopted the M15 Rifle (also known as the T44) to replace not only their present M1 Rifle, but the Browning Automatic Rifle, the .30 M1 Carbine, and the Pistol (.45 ACP).

That means two things, just on the surface: 1) that the military is still of the opinion that the rifleman has some use in the war of the future, and 2) it means that for the same number of men, there will be more of them using the rifle. . . .

Fayetteville, Ark. HARMON L. REMMEL

When Mr. Shoemaker talks about the "elimination of such agencies as the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice" he stomps upon well-established American tradition and constitutional right: "The right of the people to keep and bear arms" (Amendment II).

Now there is certainly nothing in our Constitution that even implies that the government is required to support the costs of ammunition and other items, of a civilian marksman-

ship training program . . . but I feel these dollars are well expended as supervised training programs develop not only marksmanship in the individual rifleman but also *teach proper and safe handling of weapons*.

If, as some say, our country's downfall could only be consummated by fifth-column subversive elements within our borders, then trained organized civilian riflemen might be our only salvation. . . . Heavy armor is vulnerable to the individual rifleman—as proved by the Hungarian revolt of a few short months ago.

Kansas City, Mo. H. KENNETH TAYLOR

Knowland in 1960

I highly commend your views on Senator William Knowland [May 11], in practical endorsement of his 1960 candidacy. . . . His constant poise, keen appraisals, firm and fair pronouncements, fearless and forceful presentation of facts and vital issues, constitute him a worthy leader. . . .

Rock Island, Ill. REV. H. W. MUNSTER

The Spanish Dilemma

Our intellectual tourists are a unique, even funny species. Particularly the moderns of the extreme left and the extreme right. They are always finding strange things everywhere, underlying crises, ghosts and witches.

Take Spain, for instance. . . . Now Mr. Kuehnelt-Leddihn unearths and exposes an indescribable economic and political crisis about to explode [March 30].

I know Spain and the Spaniards, having lived with them for several decades. I know, if you please, what makes them tick. This country has been going through a crisis since it was invaded by Napoleon, since it lost the Spanish-American colonies. That crisis became acute when Alfonso XIII, defeated indirectly by the municipal elections . . . abdicated and left the country in the hands of the ill-prepared so-called Liberals.

The Liberals failed utterly and ended their fumbling efforts by inviting the Soviets to take over, prac-

tically. General Sanjurjo, one of the best men Spain has produced in centuries, was killed in an airplane accident and Franco was left in charge of the . . . revolution which avoided the communization of Spain and of Europe.

I am a democrat and therefore cannot approve of Franco's extremism. But he saved Spain, its traditions and stability, eluded the tempting offers of Hitler and Mussolini and is planting the necessary firm bases for the reconstruction of Spain along modern lines.

Mr. Kuehnelt-Leddihn's description of the internal Spanish situation is wrong. His list of parties forming the "uneasy coalition" is meaningless if meant to be a symptom of "tension and decomposition." In variety there is strength, and the Spaniards love and believe in their country's mission and brilliant future. They are frugal, hard workers, quite capable of mastering modern methods and "machine production" if properly trained. Personally they are individualists and will always remain so.

RAYMOND M. GOODING
Poughkeepsie, N.Y.

Honest Rage—and Rage

Mr. Schlamm's "A Book to Burn" [May 4] filled me with unqualified admiration. In company with many of the regular contributors to NATIONAL REVIEW, Mr. Schlamm continues to show that honest rage is still the only possible antidote to clever nonsense.

DR. ROBERT J. NEEDLES
St. Petersburg, Fla

Your magazine is what we, in Britain, would call a "mud-slinging rag," but I was really surprised to see you stoop so low in last week's issue as to print William Schlamm's disgusting drivel under the fanatical title of "A Book to Burn." [May 4]

As far as I can see, Mr. Schlamm has no actual correction to make to *A Dictionary of Politics*; he is furious just because this book is so tolerant and unbiased. May I remind Mr. Schlamm that this book is meant for a sane, broad-minded British public. Perhaps he could suggest to Penguin Books that they include a slight slant, just a little bias in all editions that they send across the Atlantic, just to please the intolerant, witch-hunting

reader that Mr. Schlamm typifies. . . . In Britain we believe in giving impartial information, whether it be about East European countries or any other subject.

Cincinnati, Ohio

MEGAN EDWARDS

Pollsters in the USSR

On the repudiation of Russia's bonds, April 27 issue, there is one "fact" you left out. Radio Moscow said [April 13] "Payment of the bonds is withheld so the money can be used to raise the standard of living for the people, and this is with the consent of the people." Darlington, S.C.

GEORGE SIENES

Queens College Conservatives

In your comments [April 13] regarding the first issue of *The Individualist*, you mention Richard Whalen as founder of the Robert A. Taft Club at Queens College.

I believe I have a clarification to make. The Robert A. Taft Club was founded by Joseph LaTorre in his last semester at Queens College in October of 1954. As President of the Young Republican Club, he instituted interest in conservatism to the extent that the name of the club was changed. . . .

As he was graduating in February 1955, Mr. LaTorre was unable to carry out all his plans for fostering the spirit of individualism. . . . Richard Whalen took over the club the following semester and did an excellent job. . . .

New York City

ANNETTE LATORRE

Independent Thinking

Many thanks for giving coverage in the April 27 issue "The Ivory Tower" to our Midwest College Young Republican Convention.

There is one correction which I feel should be made. . . . in reference to the quotation attributed to me. In your comment, the quotation read in part: "In all the conventions since 1952. . . it was only necessary, to win endorsement for a measure, to note that 'Ike is against it.'"

To give the correct meaning, the shortened version should have read: "In all the conventions since 1952, it was only necessary, to win endorsement for a measure, to note that 'Ike is for it.'"

The significance of the recent con-

vention is that this year the college Young Republicans were more interested in the merits of the issue, and would not be stampeded into supporting measures just because Eisenhower was either for or against them. . . .

Wilmette, Ill.

OWEN FRISBY

The ACLU and the Fifth

. . . I like your open letter to the American Civil Liberties Union on the question of the Fifth Amendment [April 6] which shows very clearly how the Liberals lack what I consider real reporting. . . . They have continually drawn attention to the irrelevance of the use of the Fifth Amendment to the question of guilt, and now even the President shares your views that "if a man has to go to the Fifth Amendment there must be something he doesn't want to tell."

I am a professor of Political Science, and. . . NATIONAL REVIEW has helped me immensely in keeping the record straight before my students.

Slippery Rock, Pa.

ANTHONY KUBEK

No Substitute for Victory

James Burnham's "The Changing Nature of War" [April 20] reflects the deep sense of futility which is the hallmark of the true intellectual. It seems the development of a "Doctrine of War" and a "Military Structure" capable of coping with the problems posed by the advent of nuclear weapons has been entrusted to the military services who, in Mr. Burnham's opinion, do not know which end is up in this brave new world.

Only one ray of hope seems to pierce the gloom which encircles Mr. Burnham: A small group of "analysts," apparently on their own, is "making another try at stating a new war doctrine. . . and suggesting a military structure." These "analysts," presumably, will be unhampered by military experience or tradition, and certainly not by that awful "orthodox nineteenth-century doctrine" expressed by General MacArthur in Korea: "There is no substitute for victory."

As a non-intellectual, but practicing, artilleryman, I have had a worm's-eye view of two World Wars and the horsing around that goes on

among politicians before, during and after wars. Based on this experience only, and admittedly without the benefit of clairvoyance that goes with intellectualism, I should like to offer these predictions anent World War III:

a) Our side will win.

b) The architect of victory will not have had the benefit of Doctrine or Structure from Mr. Burnham's "analysts," because the Word will not have been able to break through the static which eternally envelops Olympus.

c) The war will have been fought in a strategic fog, and the winner will have had only one unchanging objective—victory.

Los Angeles, Cal.

W. F. MAHER

Colonel, U.S. Army (Ret.)

American Exile in Geneva

I warned you last year that this would happen! [NATIONAL REVIEW, April 25, 1956]. I begged you to take a real interest in what was happening to poor U. Alexis Johnson. I even worked out a brilliant plan to help him. But what did you do? You just laughed! And now look at his pathetic plight! Last year he was still able to make it to the meeting place at least a few minutes twice a week. He's now down to about once a month. . . . Do you suppose Dulles has forgotten him? Maybe THEY are afraid to let him come home. I wonder if he would like some pen pals?

MARGUERITE LAMMERSEN

N. Hollywood, Cal.

GF

GENERAL FOODS DECLARES ITS 142nd COMMON DIVIDEND

A dividend of 50 cents a share on the common stock will be paid on June 5, 1957 to stockholders of record at the close of business, May 13, 1957.

Leonard F. Genz, Secretary

GENERAL FOODS CORPORATION
250 North Street, White Plains, N.Y.

GF's family of quality products
includes Post Cereals and Baker's
Angel Flake Coconut.